

HT-02-030



Application no. 10/633,105

IFW

May 9, 2006

TO: Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attn: Art Unit 2627 - Examiner: Mark S. Blouin

FROM: George O. Saile, Reg. No. 19,572  
28 Davis Avenue  
Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12603

SUBJECT: Serial #: 10/633,105  
File Date: 08/01/03  
Inventor: Cherng-Chui Han et al.  
Examiner: Mark S. Blouin  
Art Unit: 2627  
Title: SHORT YOKE LENGTH PLANAR WRITER WITH LOW DC  
COIL RESISTANCE

### RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Restriction Requirement in the Office Action dated 04/27/06. In that office action, restriction was required to one of the following Inventions under 35 U.S.C. 121:

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 10, 2006.

Signature   
Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg. No. 37,761

Date: 5/10/06

The inventions stated are:

I – Claims 21-30 drawn to a planar magnetic write head, classified in class 360, subclass 126, and

II - Claims 1-20, drawn to a process for making a planar magnetic write head, classified in class 29, subclass 603+.

Applicant provisionally elects to be examined the Invention described by the Examiner as Group I – Claims 21-30 drawn to a product classified in Class 360, subclass 126. This election is made with traverse of the requirement under 37 C.F.R. 1.143 for the reasons given in the following paragraphs.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the Requirement for Restriction in the Office Action.

The Examiner gives the reasons for the distinctness between Inventions I and II as (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product, or (2) the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (M.P.E.P. 806.05(f)). However, upon reading the process Claims against the product Claims one can readily see that the process Claims are directed to a "planarizing process", and that the product claims are directed to "a planar magnetic write head, having an air bearing surface ", and that it is necessary to obtain claims in both the

process and product claim language. The process claims necessarily use the product and vice versa. The field of search must necessarily cover both the process class/subclass 29/603+ and product class/subclass 360/126, in addition to other related classes and subclasses, to provide a complete and adequate search. The fields of search for Groups I and II are clearly and necessarily co-extensive. The Examiner's suggestion that "In the instant case, the product as claimed in Group I can be made by another and materially different process such as one that does not require "...by means of chemical polishing, planarizing...", "...patterning a layer on non-magnetic material ...", etc. as required by Group II" is speculative and has nothing to do with the Claims as presented in this patent application.

Further, it is respectfully suggested that these reasons are insufficient to place the additional cost of second and third patent applications upon the applicants. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw this restriction requirement for these reasons.

Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement, and allowance of the present Patent Application, is respectfully requested.

It is requested that should there be any problems with this response, please call the undersigned Attorney at (845) 452-5863.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg. No. 37,761